UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,277	01/30/2006	Magne Hansen	43315-218973	2493

26694   7590   02/25/2009
VENABLE LLP
P.O. BOX 34385
WASHINGTON, DC 20043-9998

EXAMINER
NILANONT, YOUPAPORN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2446	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/25/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/539,277	HANSEN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	YOUPAPORN NILANONT	2446	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 January 2006</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>30 January 2006</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6-16-2005</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)   **Office Action Summary**   Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20090214

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1.   The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is

clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described
> as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to
> be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which
> said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-5, 7-8 and 10-13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Allard et al (US 5991802) in view of Andersson et al. (US

2002/0059282).

4.   **Regarding claim 1,** Allard teaches a method to respond to a request for a

function of an object connected to a control system which function is represented

as an object of an object class, the method comprising:

          receiving a web request in a web server (Allard, column 2 lines 46-

     48 "server program executing on a server computer...receives a request

     sent from the client program"), which web request is sent by a web

     presentation means (Allard, column 3 lines 64-65 "receiving requests from

     clients (e.g. browsers)") and

               said web request comprises a Uniform Resource Locator

          (URL) (Allard, column 9 lines 44-45 "request comprising a Universal

Resource Locator"), which URL comprises means to identify the

object class and the object of the object class (Allard, column 3

lines 66-67 and column 4 lines 1-3 "shim script"),

identifying in a software application the object class and the object

by use of information in the URL (Allard, column 5 lines 25-27 and lines

42-43),

querying the identified object class from the software application for

an interface to an System Object associated with the object (Allard,

column 6 lines 46-52 and 60-61),

receiving from the System Object to the software application a

reference to an interface of the System Object (Allard, column 6 lines 54-

55 and 60-61), which implements the function of the identified object

(Allard, column 6 lines 65-67),

invoking functionality of the object by means of the reference

(Allard, column 6 lines 65-67),

sending a response message to the world wide web presentation

means (Allard, column 2 line 57),

which response message is adapted to contextual

information which describes characteristics of the world wide web

presentation means (Allard, column 5 lines 44-46 "HTTP

response"), wherein the world wide web presentation means is

updated with the result of the performed function of the real-world

object (Allard, figure 1 "104" and "108", column 4 lines 47-48).

The Allard reference fails to explicitly specify that its object class and object are Aspect Object and Aspect of an Aspect Object.

However, Andersson reference shows the use of aspects as a more refined definition of the function of an object in object-oriented programming (Andersson, paragraph [0006]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have defined object and object class as taught in Allard to a more refined definition in order to enable Allard's system to represent items in the order more precisely.

5.   **Regarding claim 2,** Allard and Andersson teach the method according to claim 1, wherein the contextual information is comprised in the web request sent from the world wide web presentation means (Allard, figure 10 "HTTP Request").

6.   **Regarding claim 3,** Allard and Andersson teach the method according to claim 2, wherein the step receiving a web request, further comprising:

passing the web request from the web server to the software application (Allard, column 5 lines 18-22).

7.   **Regarding claim 4,** Allard and Andersson teach the method according to claim 1, wherein, the response message is adapted according to the contextual information by an Aspect System Object (Allard, column 4 lines 66-67 and column 5 lines 1-3).

8.   **Regarding claim 5,** Allard and Andersson teach the method according to claim 4, wherein the response message is adapted as an HTTP response (Allard, figure 8 "802", column).

9.   **Regarding claim 7,** Allard and Andersson teach the method according to

claim 1, wherein the Aspect Object during run-time inherits the Aspect from

another Aspect Object through a hierarchical structure, wherein the Aspect

Object during run-time inherits the association of the Aspect System Object

(Andersson, paragraph [0007]).

10.   **Regarding claim 8,** Allard and Andersson teach the method according to

claim 1, wherein the web presentation means is a standard web browser (Allard,

column 3 lines 64-65 "receiving requests from clients (e.g. browsers)").

11.   **Regarding claim 10,** Allard and Andersson teach the method according

to 1, wherein the contextual information of the world wide web presentation

means describes technical characteristics of the world wide web presentation

means such as type of web browser, available plug-ins or screen resolution

(Allard, figure 10 "IE3").

12.   **Regarding claim 11,** Allard and Andersson teach the method according

to claim 1, wherein the identifying step comprises:

        evaluating in the software application which function of the System

        Object the software application should query for a reference based on the

        contextual information in addition to the identified Aspect Object, the

        Aspect of the Aspect Object (column 6 lines 49-52).

13.   **Regarding claims 12 and 13,** please see rejection of claim 1 above.

Specifically, Allard and Andersson disclose a web server, an Aspect Object, an

Aspect System Object and a software application which make up the system as

claimed in claim 12. Furthermore, the cited reference recite process that is done

in computer program such as C++ or HTTP, therefore, the limitation of claim 3 has been met.

14.   Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allard et al (US 5991802) in view of Andersson et al. (US 2002/0059282) as applied to claims 1 and 4 above, and further in view of MacFarlane et al. (US 2001/0042081).

15.   **Regarding claim 6,** Allard and Andersson teach the method according to claim 4. However they do not explicitly disclose that a web server response message is adapted according to extensible markup language (XML).

        Conversely, MacFarlane discloses a method for a server to respond to HTTP request by generating markup document such as XML (MacFarlane, paragraphs [0102] and [0105]). It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in the art, to have used XML in response to HTTP request to display a result of Allard's shopping cart in order to represent information to user in easier to understand format and adjust to wider variety of applications that may be used in user's device (MacFarlane, paragraph [0023]).

16.   Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allard et al (US 5991802) in view of Andersson et al. (US 2002/0059282) as applied to claims 1 and 8 above, and further in view of Brid et al. (US 2002/0143822).

17.   **Regarding claim 9,** Allard and Andersson teach the method according to claim 8, but does not explicitly state that the web browser is installed on a wireless device such as a cell phone Personal Digital Assistant (PDA), a cell phone or a handheld computing device.

However, Brid shows that wireless devices such as handheld computers, cellular phones, PDAs are able to receive web page content (Brid, [0002]) via a web browser (Brid, [0020]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in art, at the time the invention was made, to have designed Allard's system in consideration of such wireless devices taught in Brid in order to provide mobility to users who wants to make purchases.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YOUPAPORN NILANONT whose telephone number is (571) 270-5655. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday and alternate Friday at 8:30 AM - 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey C. Pwu can be reached on (571) 272-6798. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from
the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information
for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public
PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through
Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-
direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR
system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-
free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service
Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-
9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Y. N./
Examiner, Art Unit 2446

/Jeffrey Pwu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2446